

The Sun.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 14, 1916.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second Class Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.
DAILY, Per Month, 60c
SUNDAY, Per Month, 25c
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month, 85c
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year, \$10.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year, \$10.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year, \$10.00

Foreign Rates.
DAILY, Per Month, 1.25
SUNDAY, Per Month, 50c
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month, 1.75
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year, \$20.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year, \$20.00

All checks, money orders, etc., to be made payable to The Sun.

Readers of THE SUN leaving town for the summer months can have the daily and Sunday editions delivered to them in any part of the country or abroad on the terms stated above. Addresses changed as often as desired. Order through publisher or directly to Publication Office, Telephone 2200 Beckman.

Published daily, including Sunday, by the Sun Publishing Association, at 100 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York, at the Sun Building, under the management of William C. Reek, 100 Nassau street, New York, President, Secretary, C. E. Lutton, 150 Nassau street, New York, Treasurer.

London office, 40-43 Fleet street, London, E.C. 4, England.
Paris office, 6, rue de la Monnaie, Paris, France.
Washington office, 1000 Building, Brookline office, 100 Lexington street.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts and illustrations for publication wish to have their names and addresses published in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

A Song for Flag Day.

Espies of Drake and Key, inspire my song
With something of the vital, living fire
That thrilled you when your fingers
Were set to work on Freedom's banner.

Our country's earlier years!
For I, in those red days of battle flame,
When half the stricken world is mad
With Mars.

And lifted France seems a forgotten name,
Would sing the Stripes and Stars?

Although heet in strife and first un-
der, our rude Fort Stanwix in the wilderness,
Our flag before the wide eyes of the world,
Stands not for storm and stress.

Though we may glory that it waved on high,
When cheers at Yorktown rang from
lip to lip,
That heard Lexington's immortal cry
Of "Don't give up the ship!"

That our chaplains' stark heights it
tossed,
When valor upward urged to victory,
And led, when an ill-fated cause was
lost.

With Sherman to the sea;
And that it fluttered proudly at the peak
Above the challenging cannon's roar
and roar.

When Dewey swept defiant through the
reck,
Past strident Corbett;
Nor stripe nor clustered star has ever
counted.

Save but for freedom, for the broader
birth
Of liberty—the clearer, clearer dawn
Of brotherhood on earth.

Wave then, O banner! May thy mission
be
To heal the grievous wounds, the wounds
of hate,
Triumph over wrong and tyranny,
Beloved Stripes and Stars!

CLINTON SCOLLARD.

The Democratic Convention.

Those Democrats assembling to-
day at St. Louis who perceive the
absurd futility of attacking Mr.
HUGHES on the charge that he has
dishonored and degraded the bench
of the Supreme Court of the United
States are reported as favoring a
campaign on the general lines indi-
cated by this question to the Repub-
lican party: "What would your candi-
date have done differently from
Wilson?"

Perhaps that is the squar-
est and most honest attitude the Demo-
cratic could assume under the circum-
stances; but even that question would
not quite go to the heart of things.
It would not present the real issue
between CHARLES E. HUGHES and
WOODROW WILSON.

It is not altogether a pleasant
or polite task to state the real issue
involved. The plain statement of it
involves personal comparisons more
or less odious, contrasts of character,
processes of qualitative analysis that
cannot be made searching without a
departure from the accustomed am-
enities. Perhaps the difficulty of state-
ment can be avoided best by propos-
ing a question to the Republican
party: "What would your candi-
date have done differently from
Wilson?"

Perhaps that is the squar-
est and most honest attitude the Demo-
cratic could assume under the circum-
stances; but even that question would
not quite go to the heart of things.
It would not present the real issue
between CHARLES E. HUGHES and
WOODROW WILSON.

It is not altogether a pleasant
or polite task to state the real issue
involved. The plain statement of it
involves personal comparisons more
or less odious, contrasts of character,
processes of qualitative analysis that
cannot be made searching without a
departure from the accustomed am-
enities. Perhaps the difficulty of state-
ment can be avoided best by propos-
ing a question to the Republican
party: "What would your candi-
date have done differently from
Wilson?"

Perhaps that is the squar-
est and most honest attitude the Demo-
cratic could assume under the circum-
stances; but even that question would
not quite go to the heart of things.
It would not present the real issue
between CHARLES E. HUGHES and
WOODROW WILSON.

It is not altogether a pleasant
or polite task to state the real issue
involved. The plain statement of it
involves personal comparisons more
or less odious, contrasts of character,
processes of qualitative analysis that
cannot be made searching without a
departure from the accustomed am-
enities. Perhaps the difficulty of state-
ment can be avoided best by propos-
ing a question to the Republican
party: "What would your candi-
date have done differently from
Wilson?"

Perhaps that is the squar-
est and most honest attitude the Demo-
cratic could assume under the circum-
stances; but even that question would
not quite go to the heart of things.
It would not present the real issue
between CHARLES E. HUGHES and
WOODROW WILSON.

It is not altogether a pleasant
or polite task to state the real issue
involved. The plain statement of it
involves personal comparisons more
or less odious, contrasts of character,
processes of qualitative analysis that
cannot be made searching without a
departure from the accustomed am-
enities. Perhaps the difficulty of state-
ment can be avoided best by propos-
ing a question to the Republican
party: "What would your candi-
date have done differently from
Wilson?"

Perhaps that is the squar-
est and most honest attitude the Demo-
cratic could assume under the circum-
stances; but even that question would
not quite go to the heart of things.
It would not present the real issue
between CHARLES E. HUGHES and
WOODROW WILSON.

It is not altogether a pleasant
or polite task to state the real issue
involved. The plain statement of it
involves personal comparisons more
or less odious, contrasts of character,
processes of qualitative analysis that
cannot be made searching without a
departure from the accustomed am-
enities. Perhaps the difficulty of state-
ment can be avoided best by propos-
ing a question to the Republican
party: "What would your candi-
date have done differently from
Wilson?"

Perhaps that is the squar-
est and most honest attitude the Demo-
cratic could assume under the circum-
stances; but even that question would
not quite go to the heart of things.
It would not present the real issue
between CHARLES E. HUGHES and
WOODROW WILSON.

It is not altogether a pleasant
or polite task to state the real issue
involved. The plain statement of it
involves personal comparisons more
or less odious, contrasts of character,
processes of qualitative analysis that
cannot be made searching without a
departure from the accustomed am-
enities. Perhaps the difficulty of state-
ment can be avoided best by propos-
ing a question to the Republican
party: "What would your candi-
date have done differently from
Wilson?"

Perhaps that is the squar-
est and most honest attitude the Demo-
cratic could assume under the circum-
stances; but even that question would
not quite go to the heart of things.
It would not present the real issue
between CHARLES E. HUGHES and
WOODROW WILSON.

It is not altogether a pleasant
or polite task to state the real issue
involved. The plain statement of it
involves personal comparisons more
or less odious, contrasts of character,
processes of qualitative analysis that
cannot be made searching without a
departure from the accustomed am-
enities. Perhaps the difficulty of state-
ment can be avoided best by propos-
ing a question to the Republican
party: "What would your candi-
date have done differently from
Wilson?"

Perhaps that is the squar-
est and most honest attitude the Demo-
cratic could assume under the circum-
stances; but even that question would
not quite go to the heart of things.
It would not present the real issue
between CHARLES E. HUGHES and
WOODROW WILSON.

It is not altogether a pleasant
or polite task to state the real issue
involved. The plain statement of it
involves personal comparisons more
or less odious, contrasts of character,
processes of qualitative analysis that
cannot be made searching without a
departure from the accustomed am-
enities. Perhaps the difficulty of state-
ment can be avoided best by propos-
ing a question to the Republican
party: "What would your candi-
date have done differently from
Wilson?"

Perhaps that is the squar-
est and most honest attitude the Demo-
cratic could assume under the circum-
stances; but even that question would
not quite go to the heart of things.
It would not present the real issue
between CHARLES E. HUGHES and
WOODROW WILSON.

It is not altogether a pleasant
or polite task to state the real issue
involved. The plain statement of it
involves personal comparisons more
or less odious, contrasts of character,
processes of qualitative analysis that
cannot be made searching without a
departure from the accustomed am-
enities. Perhaps the difficulty of state-
ment can be avoided best by propos-
ing a question to the Republican
party: "What would your candi-
date have done differently from
Wilson?"

Perhaps that is the squar-
est and most honest attitude the Demo-
cratic could assume under the circum-
stances; but even that question would
not quite go to the heart of things.
It would not present the real issue
between CHARLES E. HUGHES and
WOODROW WILSON.

It is not altogether a pleasant
or polite task to state the real issue
involved. The plain statement of it
involves personal comparisons more
or less odious, contrasts of character,
processes of qualitative analysis that
cannot be made searching without a
departure from the accustomed am-
enities. Perhaps the difficulty of state-
ment can be avoided best by propos-
ing a question to the Republican
party: "What would your candi-
date have done differently from
Wilson?"

Perhaps that is the squar-
est and most honest attitude the Demo-
cratic could assume under the circum-
stances; but even that question would
not quite go to the heart of things.
It would not present the real issue
between CHARLES E. HUGHES and
WOODROW WILSON.

It is not altogether a pleasant
or polite task to state the real issue
involved. The plain statement of it
involves personal comparisons more
or less odious, contrasts of character,
processes of qualitative analysis that
cannot be made searching without a
departure from the accustomed am-
enities. Perhaps the difficulty of state-
ment can be avoided best by propos-
ing a question to the Republican
party: "What would your candi-
date have done differently from
Wilson?"

Perhaps that is the squar-
est and most honest attitude the Demo-
cratic could assume under the circum-
stances; but even that question would
not quite go to the heart of things.
It would not present the real issue
between CHARLES E. HUGHES and
WOODROW WILSON.

Having the same causes of weakness
which have controlled our Government
for the last three years continued in
the future except the withdrawal of
power from the Democratic party."

All the oratory of MARTIN H.
GLYNN of New York to-day at St.
Louis; of OLLIE M. JAMES of Ken-
tucky to-morrow when the permanent
organization is effected; of JOHN W.
WESCOTT of New Jersey when he
obtains the floor on Thursday or
Friday to renominate a President
whom this same party pledged to the
principle of a single term; all the
calculated shoutings of the delegates
and the gallery; all the fine phrases
of a platform prepared under Mr.
Wilson's own supervision—none of
these things and no political alchemy
or magic besides can change the na-
ture of Woodrow Wilson and make
him other than he has been through-
out the three years and three months
of a régime most unfortunate and
humiliating to the country.

The convention at St. Louis, if it
wants to present squarely the most
important question concerning the
voters this year, will be honest
enough to invite a comparison be-
tween the man Woodrow Wilson and
the man CHARLES EVANS HUGHES in
stability of character, in solidity of
attainments, in sincerity of profes-
sions, in courage of performance, in
loyalty to conscience, in the rectitude
that abides in the heart and not in
the larynx.

We hope THE SUN may be per-
mited for assuming for this single
occasion somewhat of the tone and
manner of the convention orator.

A Preliminary Chill.

MR. HUGHES enters the Presi-
dential campaign with the indorsement
of Senator STONE as "a gentleman of
good ability and good character."
From the wilson President of the
Missouri Health Society the econ-
omy is not to be scorned. But Mr.
STONE finds the Republican candidate
uncongenial, saying of him:

"He is so reserved and exclusive as to
leave the impression that he emanated
from the north pole and came to the tem-
perate zone with frost in his whiskers,
not yet by any means dissolved."

This is enough to convulse the
Senate. If there is a colder, smoother,
slicker sample of politics than the
Hon. WILLIAM JOEL STONE, where can
he be found, unless in the White
House? Gunhouse BILL, Frosty BILL,
Rubberized WILLIAM, are some of
the names that the senior Senator
from Missouri has earned by a suc-
cess in public life that owes nothing
to the sonorous. In the old days in
Missouri he acquired distinction by
absorbing the yolks of eggs and con-
cealing the shells. He was an adept
in low visibility and his gunshots
left no trace.

In those times of self-lit Mr.
STONE was as much hair as any man
in Missouri, where an abnormal ac-
cent of beard is notable, but the
hair was on his cranium, a down-
flowing mane that shook in the wind.
It set off a lean, insatiable face
never stirred by a ripple of emotion.
Gunhouse BILL was almost soulless,
even when he spoke. His voice never
carried far. Whispering was an art
with him. As a Senator he is famous
for low audibility. His speeches are
punctuated with "Louder!" from his
colleagues, but he declines to be
heard. Whispering BILL is audible
only in the record.

Such is WILLIAM JOEL STONE,
keeper of the Administration's reputa-
tion, caretaker of the policies, its
megaphone in type. Representing the
excellent good-fellowship and hail
fellow well met humanity of Woodrow
Wilson, the Senator shivers and con-
cens when the name of the Republi-
can candidate is mentioned. If Mr.
STONE feels so cold when CHARLES
EVANS HUGHES is nominated, what
kind of a day will election day be
for the Democratic party?

"Undiluted Americanism."

The asinine attempt to represent
Mr. HUGHES as something less than
an out and out American perished
miserably on the day it was born.

That day was yesterday, and the
first that smashed Campaign Misp-
representation Number Two was Mr.
HUGHES'S OWN.

Is there any newspaper in this
neighborhood or elsewhere dull
enough not to perceive, or disingenu-
ous enough not to admit, that the first
fell heavily upon the lie?

The Powerful Pennsylvania.

When the Stars and Stripes were
run up on the Pennsylvania at Nor-
folk on Monday one of the most
formidable warships in the world was
added to the United States navy. The
naval experts declare that she has
no equal in gun power and ability to
stand up under punishment. In the
Stokers fight the British battleship
Wasp like lived through a terrible
pounding by the German dread-
noughts because her vital parts were
well armored. The battle cruiser
Queen Mary soon succumbed because
she was not well protected. In her
case there was a compromise to give
her great speed. Her forte was at-
tacking at long range with her 13.5
inch guns. As she had to fight at
a medium range, on account of the
atmosphere and the tactics forced
upon her, she was doomed.

The Wasp like stood up, kept on
firing her 15 inch guns, and got out
of the trap. Within a few days of
that exhibition of battleship stanch-
ness the Pennsylvania goes into com-
mission. He who runs may read.
We hope the lesson will not be lost
upon Congress. Here is a ship of

31,400 tons normal displacement,
with a belt amidships 13 1/2 inches
thick and turret protection of from
9 to 18 inches, built to withstand
the heaviest broadsides and keep
afloat. She carries a main battery
of twelve 14 inch guns and a sec-
ondary battery of twenty-two 5 inch
guns, together with four torpedo
tubes. She has a speed of twenty-
one knots. Her fuel oil only, which
increases her radius of action at
least 40 per cent, for the same
weight of fuel, and she can quickly
replenish at sea from a tanker.

A leviathan indeed is this Ameri-
can superdreadnought; a fortress
that can deal destruction and escape
itself unless pitted against a ship
as well protected and of superior
armament. But there is no such ship
afloat in any other navy at the pres-
ent time. The Pennsylvania is said
to have a rival in the Japanese
dreadnought Fuso of 31,300 tons.
There is not much to choose between
their armaments, for the Fuso has a
main battery of twelve 14 inch guns
and a secondary battery of sixteen
6 inch guns. She can make 22.5
knots, and is therefore slightly faster.
Particulars of her protection are
lacking, but it is doubtful whether
her armor is as thick at vital points
as the Pennsylvania's.

The Queen Elizabeths of the British
navy carry 15 inch guns, but only
eight of them, and these ships have
an advantage of four knots over
the Pennsylvania in speed. A greater
range for the British 15 inch guns is
claimed, and this with higher speed
would give the Queen Elizabeths an
initial advantage over the Pennsylva-
nia in very clear weather. But our
ordnance experts say that the range
of the American 14 inch naval
gun is as great. If that is the fact
the Queen Elizabeth with her eight
big guns and armor not as thick
would be no match for the Pennsylva-
nia with her twelve big guns in a
fight to a finish.

Learning About Trade.

RICHARD, set at 14, pursuing cer-
tain studies on the threshold of high
school, is having excessive trouble
with a subject styled "commercial
geography." This consists of the
names of countries and cities, the lo-
cation of trade routes, imports and
exports, transportation, and perplex-
ing references to a medium called
foreign exchange. As presented to
RICHARD most of these matters have
to be memorized outright like a Latin
declension; the many facts that are
to be learned appear largely unre-
lated and arbitrary, and undue dis-
couragement is RICHARD'S portion.

A perusal of his text book shows
that his difficulties arise from a single
circumstance: the authors did
not think it worth while to pause oc-
casionally and tell a story. At four-
teen RICHARD has only a slight knowl-
edge of world history, yet a pretty
fair acquaintance with that is neces-
sary if the trade of nations is to be
comprehended.

RICHARD'S interest in Russian com-
merce would be livelier for knowing
something about the blend of relig-
ious and material incentives forever
governing the children of the Czar to
reach toward Constantinople. In a
few dry paragraphs devoted to the
Turkish Empire there is no mention
of the Bagdad Railway and its thril-
ling political significance. The boy
finds quite meaningless the fact that
Brazil speaks Portuguese while the
rest of South America speaks Span-
ish. But he had no need to memo-
rize it when he had heard the rom-
antic tale of how a pope divided the
undiscovered countries of the world
between Portugal and Spain by a
meridian that left the shoulder of
the continent.

To interpolate such bits of history
as these is to throw upon the col-
umns of trade statistics a powerful
light. The enflaming totals in dol-
lars and francs become an index to
the ambitions of nations and the
struggles of generations of men. Nor
is the fascination of this deeper in-
sight the sole reward. For a people
to understand the efforts and long-
ings of their fellows must always be
the first step in acquiring dominion
over trade.

Greece in More Trouble.

KING CONSTANTINE, according to a
despatch from Athens, is to order the
complete demobilization of the Greek
army. The mobilization of this force,
which was ordered several months
ago, has caused great dissatisfaction
among the people and exhausted the
State's treasury; it effected nothing
of value to the country; its announced
purpose, the repelling of a Bulgarian
invasion, was defeated by a secret
understanding that gave the Bulgars
control of some of the strongest fron-
tier forts in East Macedonia along
the line of the Allies' contemplated
northward advance.

Demobilization has removed the
blockade upon Greek ports and the
embargo upon Greek ships in French
and British ports. The Entente Al-
lies had placed this restrictive meas-
ure on Greek shipping after the Bul-
garians' entrance upon Greek ter-
ritory. It was the most powerful
weapon that could be used against a
maritime nation such as Greece and
a country where the interruption of
sea communication brings such dis-
astrous consequences.

The Allies are evidently preparing
for an advance within a short time
into the Balkans; the activity at
Salonica, the building by the Bulgar-
ian and Germanic forces of strong
defensive positions along the Grecian
frontier and the recent bombardment
of the Bulgarian coast all indicate an
approaching struggle for supremacy
in this part of the war front, and

for this reason it was evident that the
Allies did not wish to leave their
chief base in the Aegean insecure nor
Greece a source of supplies for their
enemies. This, judging from Con-
STANTINE'S past policy, they believed
would be the result if they did not
take the severe measures to which
they resorted.

The Allies have also announced that
they will use all means necessary
to enforce the treaties safeguarding
the Greek Constitution and Greek
unity. In so doing Great Britain,
France and Russia fall back upon the
protectorship of the country which
they undertook at the time of its in-
dependence. Greece is thus more
completely under their power than at
any time since the war began.

The demobilization returns to their
homes the great body of the electorate,
who had no voice in the formation of
the so-called "neutral" Cabinet. It
declared the election unconstitutional
and it will now have an opportunity
to register its opposition to CON-
STANTINE'S Government. Greece's tribu-
lations by no means over. But her
past course in violating her treaty
pledge, betraying the popular will and
dealing in secret concessions and com-
promises does not inspire a strong ap-
peal for sympathy.

Forty-eight Stars in One Constellation.

Old Glory paints the breeze to-day
as no other, probably, of all the
days that have passed since that one
139 years ago when the Continental
Congress resolved "That the flag of
the United States be thirteen stripes,
alternate red and white, that the
union be thirteen stars, white in a
blue field, representing a new con-
stellation." This year's Flag Day will
have no perfunctory observance.

This nation is now as sound and
vigorous as ever. The sisterhood of
States represented by the constella-
tion with thirty-five added members
is firmly bound in the spirit of the
fathers still symbolized by the origi-
nal thirteen stripes. What internal
disorders there have been were sym-
ptoms fortunately manifest in time to
check the effect of the disturbing
forces whose existence they predi-
cated. Over the land to-day sweeps
revitalized loyalty and union.

The hills of resolution that recently
have inspired earnest and impressive
but locally scattered manifestations
of disapproval for demonstrations of
disloyalty or erroneous concepts of
civic obligation are gathered into one
mighty stream. The symbolism of
the flag, of which the disloyal pro-
prietors by their acts of dese-
ration, was never more clear and
luminous than it is on this fourteenth
day of June in this tremendous year
of history, 1916.

The proposed Democratic plank
calling for amendment of the Consti-
tution to make Federal Judges in-
eligible for election to administrative
office would maintain satisfactorily
the precedent set by the single term plank
of 1912.

I know baseball playing in the streets
on Sunday is not a crime, but I don't
consider this a blot on a boy's char-
acter—Mother of one of the "finger
printed" boys.

Sometimes our excellent police seem
more anxious to find new blots than
to wipe out old ones. As for the
character of a boy's character, it is
not a blot on a boy's character—Mother
of one of the "finger printed" boys.

Now is the opportune time for the
Democratic party to get most of the
Progressives—WILLIAM J. BYRAN.

If Mr. BYRAN means the Progress-
ive party of 1914 there's not much of
it to get.

The Marshall-Sullivan-Baker-More-
head-Major contest for the Vice-Pres-
idential nomination should be settled
quickly enough to leave abundance of
time for free and open discussion of
suffrage.

Though 17,000 persons paraded for
preparations through the streets of
Hartford a week ago, the commanding
officer of the First Infantry found it
necessary to-day to advertise for re-
cruits—Hartford despatch.

How is Connecticut going to raise
her quota for the first line National
Guard of 40,000 under the Hay In-
crease? It does seem as if a \$4
fine were penalty a plenty for a first
offense.

Weather conditions were highly un-
favorable—Jellison.

A tribute to German foresight.

I have always been afraid of the
quiet man—President Wilson.

In the next four months Mr. Wil-
son will have more and more reason
to be afraid of him.

Mr. HENRY FORD is also "out of poli-
tics." But then, he was never in.

O'Gorman stays at home—Newspaper
headline.

Guarding the shoes Brother Mc-
Cormac is said to be trying to keep
into?

Has Victor Mennock dyed black the
flaming poll?

Flag Day.
This day let us hail it,
On high let all men lit,
Let none dare snail it!

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF RAILROADS IN CANADA.

Chairman Trumbull of the Chesapeake and Ohio States the Exact Facts About Its Nature and Effect.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: May
I express on your courtesy to call at-
tention to an editorial article in the
New York American of May 26 last
entitled "Shortest Road to Honest Gov-
ernment Is by Way of Public Own-
ership." It is a very able and well
written article, but it is full of
wrong impressions that might be gathered
therefrom.

From the tenor of this editorial article
it is impossible to conclude that
Government ownership and operation of
railroads in Canada is a pronounced
success. Since this is not true it seems
advisable that the facts about this situa-
tion should be stated.

The Canadian Government has operated
the Intercolonial for forty-seven
years and the Prince Edward Island
for twenty-two years. The combined
operating expenses for the year ended
June 30, 1915, The combined
operating deficit was \$350,000.

In the twenty-five years the expenses of
the Intercolonial have been \$11,500,000.
For twenty-two years its
earnings were greater than its expenses,
the gain being \$1,500,000. The net de-
ficit from operation for the whole period
of forty-seven years is therefore \$9,
200,000.

During every one of the forty-three
years of its operation by the Govern-
ment the Prince Edward Island's operat-
ing expenses exceeded its earnings, re-
sulting in a total operating deficit of
\$2,400,000. The net deficit for the
Intercolonial, the deficit of the two
Government roads is \$12,500,000.

In 1914 both roads lost \$415,000, the
Intercolonial losing \$300,000 and the
Prince Edward Island \$115,000. The
combined losses for the year ended
June 30, 1915, were \$415,000. As previously
stated, these roads showed expenses
heavier than earnings for the fiscal year
ended June 30, 1915.

With such losses confronting the tax-
payers of Canada, it is pertinent to
ask whether these Government roads do
not pay taxes. Last year Canada's
total operating railroad paid the public
in taxes \$3,049,728.

Appropriations of "bonuses" under Govern-
ment railroad ownership and operation
are not a new thing. In the case of the
National Transcontinental Rail-
way, has led to a scandal. The cost of
this road was estimated originally at
\$4,000,000. It has actually cost \$95,
000,000.

In 1914 a Government commission on
this operation said that there had been
gross mismanagement, extravagance and
wastefulness. The commission recom-
mended that the road be sold to the
private owners, and that the Government
should take over the road and operate
it at a profit.

Work on the National Transcontinental
was directed and supervised by four
commissioners. The commission recom-
mended that the whole transaction reported
cost \$10,000,000 was needlessly wasted;
and that the cost of the National Trans-
continental was \$4,000,000.

Speaking of the work of the Govern-
ment's commissioners who directed the
operation of this road, this investigating
commission says:

Having failed upon a design the com-
mission proceeded to find a design to fit
the design. It may seem incredible, but
it is the fact that it was assumed that
the road should be sold to the private
owners. It was possible to earn with
a single track. There was an entire
lack of business along the line. The
road was sold to the private owners, and
in our opinion the interest payable to
the Government and the operating ex-
penses taken together will be about the
same as the Government's charges and
operating expenses of the company.

Continuing the report says that con-
tractors were not let to the lowest bidder;
that contractors were overpaid \$2,300,000
on improper classifications; that certain
contracts were paid in advance for the
handling of material; that the chair-
man of the commission paid one man
\$7,500 on a pretended damage claim for
non-activity; that money was spent
needlessly on the road; that the road
was sold to the private owners, and
in our opinion the interest payable to
the Government and the operating ex-
penses taken together will be about the